

New integrable extension of the Hubbard chain with variable range hopping

Shuichi MURAKAMI [‡]

*Department of Applied Physics, Faculty of Engineering,
University of Tokyo,
Hongo 7-3-1, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan.*

(Received:

Abstract

New integrable variant of the one-dimensional Hubbard model with variable-range correlated hopping is studied. The Hamiltonian is constructed by applying the quantum inverse scattering method on the infinite interval at zero density to the one-parameter deformation of the L -matrix of the Hubbard model. By construction, this model has $Y(\mathfrak{su}(2)) \oplus Y(\mathfrak{su}(2))$ symmetry in the infinite chain limit. Multiparticle eigenstates of the model are investigated through this method.

[‡]E-mail:murakami@appi.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp

1 Introduction

As a model of strongly correlated electrons, the Hubbard model has been attracting much interest in solid state physics. Especially, in one dimension, the model is exactly solvable [1] and its thermodynamic properties can be calculated out, which give a good testing ground for theories of strongly correlated electron systems. From the point of view of the integrability of the one-dimensional Hubbard model, there have been many works, including the pioneering work of the coordinate Bethe ansatz by Lieb and Wu [2], the quantum inverse scattering method [3, 4, 5, 6], its $SO(4)$ invariance [7, 8, 9], $Y(\mathfrak{su}(2)) \oplus Y(\mathfrak{su}(2))$ invariance in the infinite chain limit [10], and the recent development of the algebraic and analytic Bethe ansatz [11, 12].

One of the novel properties of the R -matrix $R(\lambda, \mu)$ associated with the one-dimensional Hubbard model is that it is thought to be impossible to express it as a function of a difference of two spectral parameters λ and μ . This lack of the “difference property” have prevented us from investigating underlying integrable structures of the model. For example, it is not known whether this R -matrix is expressible as an intertwiner of a certain algebra. Since the methods for calculating various correlation functions known so far [13, 14] requires understanding of such underlying structures of the model to some extent, it is necessary to deepen our knowledge of the mathematical structures of the Hubbard model in order to calculate correlation functions.

The absence of the “difference property” is not a mere harm for us. As was noticed by Shiroishi and Wadati, it produces a one-parameter integrable extension of the L -matrix and the Hamiltonian of the Hubbard model [15]. This extended Hubbard model is interpreted as an electronic model with on-site and neighboring-site interactions and correlated hopping to the neighboring sites. Though the form of the Hamiltonian is complicated and thus is difficult to be equipped with physical meaning, it can be of some help us with the understanding of the structures of the original Hubbard model.

On the other hand, we have recently discovered that the R - and L -matrices of the one-dimensional Hubbard model can be put into a formulation of quantum inverse scattering method (QISM) on an infinite interval [16, 17], which has been applied to other integrable model [18, 19]. Through that method, we can derive the existence of Yangian symmetry $Y(\mathfrak{su}(2)) \oplus Y(\mathfrak{su}(2))$ and construct n -particle states upon zero-density vacuum. Based on this work, the aim of the present paper is to put the one-parameter deformed L -matrix,

which is described in the previous paragraph, into the same formulation of the QISM on an infinite interval. Through this procedure, a new electronic Hamiltonian with variable-range correlated hopping arises. It can be embedded in a family of an infinite number of commuting operators and thus is interpreted as a one-parameter integrable deformation of the Hubbard chain. As is the case for the usual Hubbard chain, Yangian invariance of the Hamiltonian and construction of multiparticle states can be directly established as a byproduct of this method.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we shall explain integrability of the Hubbard chain of finite length and a one-parameter deformation of that model. Section 3 is devoted to the application of the QISM on an infinite interval to the one-parameter deformation of the L -matrix. Its resulting new Hamiltonian and commuting conserved operators are developed in Section 4. The Yangian $Y(\mathfrak{su}(2)) \oplus Y(\mathfrak{su}(2))$ invariance of the model follows by construction. In Section 5, we shall construct multiparticle states upon the zero-density vacuum by use of symmetries and algebras of some operators. Section 6 contains concluding remarks and discussions.

2 Hamiltonian and Monodromy Matrix on the Finite Interval

The Hamiltonian for the one-dimensional Hubbard model is

$$\hat{H} = - \sum_{j,\sigma=\uparrow,\downarrow} (c_{j+1,\sigma}^\dagger c_{j,\sigma} + c_{j,\sigma}^\dagger c_{j+1,\sigma}) + U \sum_j \left(n_{j\uparrow} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left(n_{j\downarrow} - \frac{1}{2} \right), \quad (2.1)$$

where $c_{j\sigma}$ and $c_{j\sigma}^\dagger$ are respectively the fermion annihilation and creation operators which satisfy the usual anticommutation relations, and $n_{j\sigma} = c_{j\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma}$ is the particle number operator. This Hamiltonian has a large symmetry. First, it is invariant under the partial particle-hole transformation:

$$c_{j\uparrow} \rightarrow c_{j\uparrow}, \quad c_{j\downarrow} \rightarrow (-1)^j c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger, \quad U \rightarrow -U. \quad (2.2)$$

Second, it is invariant under $SO(4)$ algebra generated by S^a and η^a ($a = x, y, z$). S^a is the usual spin-SU(2) operator defined by

$$S^a = \frac{1}{2} \sum_j \sigma_{\alpha\beta}^a c_{j\alpha}^\dagger c_{j\beta}, \quad (2.3)$$

and η^a is obtained by performing the partial particle-hole transformation (2.2) to S^a . If we go to the infinite chain limit, the symmetry is enhanced to $Y(\mathfrak{su}(2)) \oplus Y(\mathfrak{su}(2))$ Yangian [10].

The integrability of the fermionic Hubbard model (2.1) is based on a local exchange relation [6]

$$\check{\mathcal{R}}(\lambda, \mu)[\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda) \otimes_s \mathcal{L}_j(\mu)] = [\mathcal{L}_j(\mu) \otimes_s \mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)]\check{\mathcal{R}}(\lambda, \mu). \quad (2.4)$$

where $\otimes_s$ denotes the Grassman tensor product

$$[A \otimes_s B]_{\alpha\gamma, \beta\delta} = (-1)^{[P(\alpha)+P(\beta)]P(\gamma)} A_{\alpha\beta} B_{\gamma\delta}, \quad (2.5)$$

with the grading $P(1) = P(4) = 0$, $P(2) = P(3) = 1$. The expressions for the matrices $\check{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\mathcal{L}$ are presented in Appendix A.* In these expressions, we use a function $h(\lambda)$ defined by

$$\frac{\sinh 2h(\lambda)}{\sin 2\lambda} = \frac{U}{4}. \quad (2.6)$$

The Hamiltonian (2.1) is reproduced by a logarithmic derivative of the transfer matrix $\tau_{mn}(\lambda)$;

$$\hat{H} = \frac{d}{d\lambda} \ln \tau_{mn}(\lambda)|_{\lambda=0}, \quad \tau_{mn}(\lambda) = \text{str}(\mathcal{T}_{mn}(\lambda)) = \text{tr}((\sigma^z \otimes \sigma^z) \mathcal{T}_{mn}(\lambda)), \quad (2.7)$$

where the monodromy matrix $\mathcal{T}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{T}_{mn}(\lambda) = \mathcal{L}_{m-1}(\lambda) \mathcal{L}_{m-2}(\lambda) \cdots \mathcal{L}_n(\lambda) \quad (m > n). \quad (2.8)$$

There is known to be an integrable spin chain equivalent to the Hubbard model [3, 4]. If we apply the Jordan-Wigner transformation

$$c_{j\uparrow} = \sigma_n^z \cdots \sigma_{j-1}^z \sigma_j^-, \quad c_{j\downarrow} = (\sigma_n^z \cdots \sigma_{m-2}^z \sigma_{m-1}^z) \tau_n^z \cdots \tau_{j-1}^z \tau_j^-, \quad (2.9)$$

where σ and τ are the Pauli matrices, and $\sigma_j^\pm = (\sigma_j^x \pm i\sigma_j^y)/2$, $\tau_j^\pm = (\tau_j^x \pm i\tau_j^y)/2$, we get an equivalent spin model

$$\hat{H} = \sum_j (\sigma_{j+1}^+ \sigma_j^- + \sigma_j^+ \sigma_{j+1}^-) + \sum_j (\tau_{j+1}^+ \tau_j^- + \tau_j^+ \tau_{j+1}^-) + \frac{U}{4} \sum_j \sigma_j^z \tau_j^z. \quad (2.10)$$

Its integrability is supported by the spin-chain counterpart of the exchange relation [4]

$$\check{R}(\lambda, \mu)[L_j(\lambda) \otimes L_j(\mu)] = [L_j(\mu) \otimes L_j(\lambda)]\check{R}(\lambda, \mu). \quad (2.11)$$

By using $R_{12}(\lambda, \mu) = P_{12} \check{R}_{12}(\lambda, \mu)$, where P_{12} is the transposition $P(x \otimes y) = y \otimes x$, it is also written as

$$R_{12}(\lambda, \mu) L_{1j}(\lambda) L_{2j}(\mu) = L_{2j}(\mu) L_{1j}(\lambda) R_{12}(\lambda, \mu), \quad (2.12)$$

*The matrix $\mathcal{R}$ in Ref. [6, 16, 17] is written as $\check{\mathcal{R}}$ in this paper, following the standard notation. It should not be confused with the matrix written in the standard notation as $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{P}\check{\mathcal{R}}$.

As Olmedilla et al. [6] found, the exchange relation of the fermionic model, (2.4), and that of the spin chain, (2.11), can be transformed into each other.

One of the peculiarity on the integrability of the Hubbard model known for years is that the $\check{R}$ -matrix, or equivalently the $\check{R}$ -matrix, is believed to lack the difference property, i.e. it is not a function of $\lambda - \mu$, nor can it be expressed as $f(\lambda) - f(\mu)$ with some function f . This has been an obstruction for further investigations of the underlying mathematical structures of the Hubbard model. But on the other hand, the lack of the difference property allows us to consider a one-parameter integrable deformation of the Hubbard model, as noticed by Shiroishi and Wadati [15]. This works as follows. Since the R -matrix is shown to satisfy the Yang-Baxter equation of the form

$$R_{12}(\lambda, \mu)R_{13}(\lambda, \nu)R_{23}(\mu, \nu) = R_{23}(\mu, \nu)R_{13}(\lambda, \nu)R_{12}(\lambda, \mu), \quad (2.13)$$

a new L -matrix defined by

$$L_1(\lambda)_\nu = R_{13}(\lambda, \nu) \quad (2.14)$$

satisfies an exchange relation

$$R_{12}(\lambda, \mu)L_1(\lambda)_\nu L_2(\mu)_\nu = L_2(\mu)_\nu L_1(\lambda)_\nu R_{12}(\lambda, \mu). \quad (2.15)$$

By using $\check{R}_{12}(\lambda, \mu) = P_{12}R_{12}(\lambda, \mu)$, it can be alternatively written as

$$\check{R}(\lambda, \mu)[L(\lambda)_\nu \otimes L(\mu)_\nu] = [L(\mu)_\nu \otimes L(\lambda)_\nu]\check{R}(\lambda, \mu). \quad (2.16)$$

Considering that $L(\lambda)_{\nu=0} \propto L(\lambda)$, which can be checked by a direct calculation, we can say that $L(\lambda)_\nu$ is a one-parameter deformation of the L -matrix $L(\lambda)$ of the original Hubbard model. This new L -matrix can be used to produce a new Hamiltonian [15]. By using the monodromy matrix given by

$$T_{mn}(\lambda)_\nu = L_{m-1}(\lambda)_\nu L_{m-2}(\lambda)_\nu \cdots L_n(\lambda)_\nu \quad (m > n), \quad (2.17)$$

the new Hamiltonian is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_\nu &= \frac{d}{d\lambda} \ln \text{tr}(T_{mn}(\lambda)_\nu) \Big|_{\lambda=\nu} \\ &= - \sum_{j, \sigma=\uparrow, \downarrow} (c_{j+1, \sigma}^\dagger c_{j, \sigma} + c_{j, \sigma}^\dagger c_{j+1, \sigma}) \\ &\quad + \frac{U}{4 \cosh 2h(\nu)} \sum_j \left(2n_{j\uparrow} \cos^2 \nu - 2n_{j+1\uparrow} \sin^2 \nu + \sin 2\nu (c_{j\uparrow}^\dagger c_{j+1\uparrow} - c_{j+1\uparrow}^\dagger c_{j\uparrow}) - \cos 2\nu \right) \\ &\quad \left(2n_{j\downarrow} \cos^2 \nu - 2n_{j+1\downarrow} \sin^2 \nu + \sin 2\nu (c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger c_{j+1\downarrow} - c_{j+1\downarrow}^\dagger c_{j\downarrow}) - \cos 2\nu \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

We have performed the Jordan-Wigner transformation to get a fermionic Hamiltonian. The reason for choosing the special value $\lambda = \nu$ is to obtain a local Hamiltonian. This Hamiltonian is Hermitian if ν is pure imaginary, and in that case it represents a model with on-site and neighboring-site interaction and correlated hopping to the neighboring sites. The exchange relation (2.16) results in

$$[\ln \text{tr} T_{mn}(\lambda)_\nu, \ln \text{tr} T_{mn}(\mu)_\nu] = 0 \quad (2.19)$$

Therefore, the Hamiltonian is embedded in a family of infinite number of commuting operators, and so the model (2.18) is integrable. The model (2.18) includes the Hubbard model (2.1) as the $\nu = 0$ case.

So far we have discussed on a spin-chain version of the exchange relation (2.16). We can employ the same procedure used in Ref. [6] to fermionize the exchange relation of the spin chain (2.16). The Jordan-Wigner transformation relates the spin operators and the fermion operators as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sigma_j^+ \\ \sigma_j^- \end{pmatrix} = V_{j\uparrow}^2 \begin{pmatrix} c_{j\uparrow}^\dagger \\ c_{j\uparrow} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \tau_j^+ \\ \tau_j^- \end{pmatrix} = V_{j\downarrow}^2 \begin{pmatrix} c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger \\ c_{j\downarrow} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.20)$$

Here the matrices $V_{j\uparrow}$ and $V_{j\downarrow}$ are defined by [6]

$$V_{j\sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} \exp(i\frac{\pi}{2}\Omega_{j\sigma}) & 0 \\ 0 & \exp(-i\frac{\pi}{2}\Omega_{j\sigma}) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.21)$$

$$\Omega_{j\uparrow} = \sum_{k=n}^{j-1} (n_{k\uparrow} - 1), \quad \Omega_{j\downarrow} = \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} (n_{k\uparrow} - 1) + \sum_{k=n}^{j-1} (n_{k\downarrow} - 1). \quad (2.22)$$

Then we obtain the fermionic exchange relation;

$$\check{\mathcal{R}}(\lambda, \mu) [\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu \otimes_s \mathcal{L}_j(\mu)_\nu] = [\mathcal{L}_j(\mu)_\nu \otimes_s \mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu] \check{\mathcal{R}}(\lambda, \mu), \quad (2.23)$$

where the fermionic matrix $\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)$ can be calculated from the spin-chain matrix $L_j(\lambda)$ as

$$\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu = (V_{j+1,\uparrow} \otimes V_{j+1,\downarrow}) L_j(\lambda)_\nu (V_{j\uparrow}^{-1} \otimes V_{j\downarrow}^{-1}), \quad (2.24)$$

and the corresponding $\mathcal{R}$ -matrix is

$$\check{\mathcal{R}}(\lambda, \mu) = W \check{R}(\lambda, \mu) W^{-1}, \quad (2.25)$$

with $W = \sigma^z \otimes \text{diag}(1, -i, -i, 1) \otimes I_2$. Here I_n denotes the $n \times n$ unit matrix. The explicit form of $\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu$ is presented in Appendix A. The exchange relation (2.16) and (2.23) can be considered as a one-parameter deformation of (2.11) and (2.4), respectively. Note that $\check{R}(\lambda, \mu)$ or $\check{\mathcal{R}}(\lambda, \mu)$ is unchanged by this one-parameter deformation.

3 Passage to the Infinite Interval

Next we pass to the infinite interval limit using the new exchange relation (2.23). The method is identical with the one in our previous works on the original Hubbard model [16, 17]. Let

$$\mathcal{T}_{mn}(\lambda)_\nu = \mathcal{L}_{m-1}(\lambda)_\nu \mathcal{L}_{m-2}(\lambda)_\nu \cdots \mathcal{L}_n(\lambda)_\nu, \quad (3.1)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{mn}^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu = \mathcal{T}_{mn}(\lambda)_\nu \otimes_s \mathcal{T}_{mn}(\mu)_\nu. \quad (3.2)$$

$\mathcal{T}_{mn}(\lambda)_\nu$ is a monodromy matrix on the finite interval. To consider the infinite-chain limit of the monodromy matrix, we should split off the asymptotics of its vacuum expectation value for $m, -n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, this procedure is restricted to uncorrelated vacua, with which one can calculate vacuum expectation value of the monodromy matrix. Among four uncorrelated vacua, in which the electron density of each spin is either zero or unity, we take the zero-density vacuum $|0\rangle$ to renormalize the monodromy matrix. We use the following two matrices

$$V(\lambda)_\nu = \langle 0 | \mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu | 0 \rangle, \quad V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu = \langle 0 | \mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu \otimes_s \mathcal{L}_j(\mu)_\nu | 0 \rangle. \quad (3.3)$$

in order to normalize $\mathcal{T}_{mn}(\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{T}_{mn}^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)$, respectively;

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}(\lambda)_\nu = \lim_{m, -n \rightarrow \infty} V(\lambda)_\nu^{-m} \mathcal{T}_{mn}(\lambda)_\nu V(\lambda)_\nu^n, \quad (3.4)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu = \lim_{m, -n \rightarrow \infty} V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu^{-m} \mathcal{T}_{mn}^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu^n. \quad (3.5)$$

These limits converge in the weak sense, though the matrices $\mathcal{T}_{mn}(\lambda)_\nu$ and $\mathcal{T}_{mn}^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu$ do not have a definite limit when $m, -n \rightarrow \infty$. We shall call $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}(\lambda)_\nu$ a monodromy matrix on the infinite interval. It allows an alternative definition:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}(\lambda)_\nu = I_4 + \sum_j (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j(\lambda)_\nu - I_4) + \sum_{j>i} (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j(\lambda)_\nu - I_4)(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_i(\lambda)_\nu - I_4) + \cdots, \quad (3.6)$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j(\lambda)_\nu = V(\lambda)_\nu^{-j-1} \mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu V(\lambda)_\nu^j$.

For practical calculations, one should be careful that $V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu$ is not equal to the tensor product $V(\lambda)_\nu \otimes_s V(\mu)_\nu$. There appear additional off-diagonal elements due to normal ordering of operators. Direct calculations lead us to the resulting forms for $V(\lambda)_\nu$ and $V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu$;

$$V(\lambda)_\nu = \text{diag}(-\rho_8(\lambda, \nu), \rho_9(\lambda, \nu), \rho_9(\lambda, \nu), -\rho_1(\lambda, \nu)).$$

As for the matrix $V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu$, its diagonal consists of the elements of $V(\lambda)_\nu \otimes_s V(\mu)_\nu$, and its non-vanishing off-diagonal elements are

$$V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu^{12,21} = V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu^{13,31} = -i\rho_6(\lambda, \nu)\rho_6(\mu, \nu),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu^{14,23} &= -V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu^{14,32} = -i\rho_6(\lambda, \nu)\rho_2(\mu, \nu), \\
V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu^{24,42} &= V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu^{34,43} = i\rho_2(\lambda, \nu)\rho_2(\mu, \nu), \\
V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu^{23,41} &= -V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu^{32,41} = -i\rho_2(\lambda, \nu)\rho_6(\mu, \nu), \\
V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu^{14,41} &= -\rho_3(\lambda, \nu)\rho_3(\mu, \nu).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu$ is upper triangular. Since the diagonals of $V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu$ and $V(\lambda) \otimes_s V(\mu)_\nu$ are identical, $V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu$ can be diagonalized by an upper triangular matrix $U(\lambda, \mu)$ whose diagonal elements are all unity;

$$V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu = U(\lambda, \mu)_\nu (V(\lambda)_\nu \otimes_s V(\mu)_\nu) U(\lambda, \mu)_\nu^{-1}. \quad (3.7)$$

Direct calculation leads us to a remarkable and surprising fact; $U(\lambda, \mu)_\nu$ is independent of ν . It is equal to $U(\lambda, \mu)_{\nu=0} = U(\lambda, \mu)$, which has appeared in the analysis of the usual Hubbard chain [16], so we will hereafter suppress the subscript ν in $U(\lambda, \mu)_\nu$. Its matrix elements are

$$\begin{aligned}
U(\lambda, \mu)_{12,21} &= U(\lambda, \mu)_{13,31} = -i\rho_2/\rho_{10}, & U(\lambda, \mu)_{14,23} &= -U(\lambda, \mu)_{14,32} = i\rho_6/\rho_8, \\
U(\lambda, \mu)_{24,42} &= U(\lambda, \mu)_{34,43} = i\rho_2/\rho_9, & U(\lambda, \mu)_{23,41} &= -U(\lambda, \mu)_{32,41} = i\rho_6/\rho_7, \\
U(\lambda, \mu)_{14,41} &= -\rho_5/\rho_7,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\rho_i = \rho_i(\lambda, \mu)$.

Taking the vacuum expectation value of the local exchange relation (2.4) yields

$$\check{\mathcal{R}}(\lambda, \mu) V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu = V^{(2)}(\mu, \lambda)_\nu \check{\mathcal{R}}(\lambda, \mu), \quad (3.8)$$

and we conclude that

$$\check{\mathcal{R}}(\lambda, \mu) \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu = \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{(2)}(\mu, \lambda)_\nu \check{\mathcal{R}}(\lambda, \mu). \quad (3.9)$$

Finally, collecting (3.9) and other equations together, we arrive at the exchange relation for the monodromy matrix $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}(\lambda)_\nu$ on the infinite interval,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{(+)}(\lambda, \mu) \left[\tilde{\mathcal{T}}(\lambda)_\nu \otimes_s \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(\mu)_\nu \right] = \left[\tilde{\mathcal{T}}(\mu)_\nu \otimes_s \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(\lambda)_\nu \right] \tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{(-)}(\lambda, \mu), \quad (3.10)$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{(\pm)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu = U_\pm(\mu, \lambda)_\nu^{-1} \check{\mathcal{R}}(\lambda, \mu) U_\pm(\lambda, \mu)_\nu, \quad (3.11)$$

$$U_\pm(\lambda, \mu)_\nu = \lim_{m \rightarrow \pm\infty} V^{(2)}(\lambda, \mu)_\nu^{-m} [V(\lambda)_\nu^m \otimes_s V(\mu)_\nu^m]. \quad (3.12)$$

Since the calculation of the matrices $U_{\pm}(\lambda, \mu)_{\nu}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{(\pm)}(\lambda, \mu)_{\nu}$ is rather technical, we do not reproduce it here. Its details are presented in Ref. [17] in the case of $\nu = 0$ (Hubbard model). The only point we should note here is that apart from some singular points (e.g. $\lambda = \mu$), we can say that $U(\lambda, \mu) = U_{\pm}(\lambda, \mu)_{\nu}$ and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(\lambda, \mu) = \tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{(\pm)}(\lambda, \mu)_{\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\rho_1 \rho_4}{i \rho_{10}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\rho_1 \rho_4}{i \rho_{10}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{-\rho_1 \rho_4}{\rho_5 - \rho_4} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -i \rho_{10} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\rho_3 \rho_4 - \rho_2^2}{\rho_3 - \rho_1} & 0 & 0 & \frac{\rho_9 \rho_{10}}{\rho_3 - \rho_1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{i \rho_1 \rho_4}{\rho_9} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -i \rho_{10} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\rho_9 \rho_{10}}{\rho_3 - \rho_1} & 0 & 0 & \frac{\rho_3 \rho_4 - \rho_2^2}{\rho_3 - \rho_1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{i \rho_1 \rho_4}{\rho_9} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_1 - \rho_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & i \rho_9 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & i \rho_9 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.13)$$

where $\rho_i = \rho_i(\lambda, \mu)$. Let us write the elements of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}(\lambda)$ as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}(\lambda)_{\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} D_{11}(\lambda)_{\nu} & C_{11}(\lambda)_{\nu} & C_{12}(\lambda)_{\nu} & D_{12}(\lambda)_{\nu} \\ B_{11}(\lambda)_{\nu} & A_{11}(\lambda)_{\nu} & A_{12}(\lambda)_{\nu} & B_{12}(\lambda)_{\nu} \\ B_{21}(\lambda)_{\nu} & A_{21}(\lambda)_{\nu} & A_{22}(\lambda)_{\nu} & B_{22}(\lambda)_{\nu} \\ D_{21}(\lambda)_{\nu} & C_{21}(\lambda)_{\nu} & C_{22}(\lambda)_{\nu} & D_{22}(\lambda)_{\nu} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.14)$$

Since the $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ -matrix is independent of the value of ν , the commutation rules between the elements of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}(\lambda)$, which are obtained from the exchange relation (3.10), are completely the same as the ones in the $\nu = 0$ case, i.e. the usual Hubbard model. The complete list of the commutation rules are found in Appendix B of Ref. [17], and it is the same in the present case.

4 Yangian Symmetry and Commuting Operators

If we follow the notion of the quantum inverse scattering method, the remaining task is to investigate the meaning of each matrix element of $\tilde{T}(\lambda)_\nu$. As is also the case for the Hubbard model [17], the commutation relations between the elements of the submatrix $A(\lambda)_\nu$ decouple from the rest of the algebra.

$$r(\lambda, \mu) (A(\lambda)_\nu \otimes A(\mu)_\nu) = (A(\mu)_\nu \otimes A(\lambda)_\nu) r(\lambda, \mu), \quad (4.1)$$

where

$$r(\lambda, \mu) = \frac{\rho_3 \rho_4 - \rho_2^2 + \rho_9 \rho_{10} \mathcal{P}}{\rho_4 (\rho_3 - \rho_1)} \quad (\rho_j = \rho_j(\lambda, \mu)), \quad (4.2)$$

and $\mathcal{P}$ is a 4×4 permutation matrix ($\mathcal{P}x \otimes y = y \otimes x$). As is remarked previously, (4.1) is identical with the one in the Hubbard model ($\nu = 0$) and we can follow the same argument as in the previous work [17]. By the reparameterization

$$v(\lambda) = -2i \cot 2\lambda \cosh 2h(\lambda), \quad (4.3)$$

the R -matrix $r(\lambda, \mu)$ turns into the rational R -matrix of the XXX spin chain,

$$r(\lambda, \mu) = \frac{iU + (v(\lambda) - v(\mu))\mathcal{P}}{iU + v(\lambda) - v(\mu)}. \quad (4.4)$$

Let us expand $A(\lambda)_\nu$ in terms of $v(\lambda)^{-1}$,

$$A(\lambda)_\nu = I_2 + iU \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{v(\lambda)^{n+1}} \left(\sum_{a=1}^3 Q_n^a(\nu) \tilde{\sigma}^a + Q_n^0(\nu) I_2 \right), \quad (4.5)$$

where $\tilde{\sigma}^x = -\sigma^y$, $\tilde{\sigma}^y = \sigma^x$, and $\tilde{\sigma}^z = \sigma^z$. This expansion can be achieved by considering the limit $v(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\Im(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty$ and by choosing the proper branch of solution of eq. (2.6), which determines h as a function of λ . (2.6) implies that

$$e^{-2h(\lambda)} = -\frac{U}{4} \sin 2\lambda \pm \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{U}{4} \sin 2\lambda \right)^2}. \quad (4.6)$$

To achieve convergence of the matrix elements $A(\lambda)_\nu$, we have to choose the lower sign here. Then it follows from general considerations [20, 21, 22] that the first six operators $Q_0^a(\nu), Q_1^a(\nu)$ generate a representation of the $Y(\mathfrak{su}(2))$ Yangian quantum group.

There is an alternative description of the Yangian $Y(\mathfrak{su}(2))$ [24] described below. The Yangian $Y(\mathfrak{su}(2))$ is a Hopf algebra spanned by six generators Q_n^a ($n = 0, 1$, $a = x, y, z$),

satisfying the following relations,

$$[Q_0^a, Q_0^b] = f^{abc} Q_0^c, \quad (4.7)$$

$$[Q_0^a, Q_1^b] = f^{abc} Q_1^c, \quad (4.8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & [[Q_1^a, Q_1^b], [Q_0^c, Q_1^d]] + [[Q_1^c, Q_1^d], [Q_0^a, Q_1^b]] \\ &= \kappa^2 (A^{abkefg} f^{cdk} + A^{cdkefg} f^{abk}) \{Q_0^e, Q_0^f, Q_1^g\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Here κ is a nonzero constant, $f^{abc} = i\varepsilon^{abc}$ is the antisymmetric tensor of structure constants of $\mathfrak{su}(2)$, and $A^{abcdef} = f^{adk} f^{bel} f^{cfm} f^{klm}$. The bracket $\{ \}$ in (4.9) denotes the symmetrized product

$$\{x_1, x_2, x_3\} = \frac{1}{3!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_3} x_{\sigma 1} x_{\sigma 2} x_{\sigma 3}. \quad (4.10)$$

The Hopf algebra structure of $Y(\mathfrak{su}(2))$ is described in ref. [24] and its representation theory, which will be used later, is developed in Ref. [25, 26].

We can use (4.5) and (3.6) to get the representation of Yangian generators;

$$Q_0^a(\nu) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_j \sigma_{\alpha\beta}^a c_{j,\alpha}^\dagger c_{j,\beta}, \quad (4.11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1^a(\nu) = & \frac{i}{2 \sin \nu \cos \nu} \left[\sum_{i>j} (\tan \nu)^{i-j} e^{2h(\nu)(2-n_i-n_j)} \sigma_{\alpha\beta}^a c_{i\alpha}^\dagger c_{j\beta} \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{i<j} (-\cot \nu)^{i-j} e^{-2h(\nu)(2-n_i-n_j)} \sigma_{\alpha\beta}^a c_{i\alpha}^\dagger c_{j\beta} \right] \\ & - \frac{iU}{4} \sum_{i,j} \text{sgn}(j-i) \sigma_{\alpha\beta}^a c_{i,\alpha}^\dagger c_{j,\gamma}^\dagger c_{i,\gamma} c_{j,\beta} + iU \cot 2h(\nu) \sin^2 \nu Q_0^a(\nu). \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

In this case the constant κ in (4.9) is equal to iU . Note that $Q_0^a(\nu) = S^a$ is just the operator of the a -component of the total spin. The representation of the Yangian algebra in the usual Hubbard model [10, 16] is a special case of $\nu = 0$ in (4.11) and (4.12).

Since the quantum determinant

$$\text{Det}_q A(\lambda)_\nu = A_{11}(\lambda)_\nu A_{22}(\check{\lambda})_\nu - A_{12}(\lambda)_\nu A_{21}(\check{\lambda})_\nu, \quad (4.13)$$

where $v(\check{\lambda}) = v(\lambda) - iU$, is in the center of the Yangian

$$[\text{Det}_q A(\lambda)_\nu, A(\mu)_\nu] = 0, \quad (4.14)$$

it provides a generating function of mutually commuting operators,

$$[\text{Det}_q A(\lambda)_\nu, \text{Det}_q A(\mu)_\nu] = 0. \quad (4.15)$$

The asymptotic expansion in terms of $v(\lambda)^{-1}$,

$$\text{Det}_q A(\lambda)_\nu = 1 + iU \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{J_n(\nu)}{v(\lambda)^{n+1}}, \quad (4.16)$$

produces $J_0(\nu) = 0$, $J_1(\nu) = i\hat{H}_{\text{long}}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_{\text{long}} = & -\frac{1}{\sin \nu \cos \nu} \left[\sum_{i>j} (\tan \nu)^{i-j} e^{2h(\nu)(1-n_{i,-\sigma}-n_{j,-\sigma})} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} \right. \\ & \left. - \sum_{i<j} (-\cot \nu)^{i-j} e^{-2h(\nu)(1-n_{i,-\sigma}-n_{j,-\sigma})} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} \right] \\ & + U(1 + 2\sin^2 \nu) \sum_i \left[\left(n_{j\uparrow} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left(n_{j\downarrow} - \frac{1}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{4} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

Due to the relation (4.15), the $J_n(\nu)$'s mutually commute. Therefore, $\hat{H}_{\text{long}}$ can be embedded in a family of infinite number of commuting operators, and can be regarded as a integrable Hamiltonian. Moreover, (4.14) indicates the $Y(\text{su}(2))$ invariance of the model;

$$[Q_0^a(\nu), \hat{H}_{\text{long}}] = 0 = [Q_1^a(\nu), \hat{H}_{\text{long}}], \quad (a = 1, 2, 3). \quad (4.18)$$

Especially, it implies that the model is $\text{su}(2)$ invariant. By subtracting a constant from $\hat{H}_{\text{long}}$, we can make this Hamiltonian invariant under partial particle-hole transformation (2.2):

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}'_{\text{long}} = & -\frac{1}{\sin \nu \cos \nu} \left[\sum_{i>j} (\tan \nu)^{i-j} e^{2h(\nu)(1-n_{i,-\sigma}-n_{j,-\sigma})} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} \right. \\ & \left. - \sum_{i<j} (-\cot \nu)^{i-j} e^{-2h(\nu)(1-n_{i,-\sigma}-n_{j,-\sigma})} c_{j\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} \right] \\ & + U(1 + 2\sin^2 \nu) \sum_j \left(n_{j\uparrow} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left(n_{j\downarrow} - \frac{1}{2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

This complicated Hamiltonian can be made simpler by noting (2.6) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}''_{\text{long}} &= -i \sin \nu \cos \nu \hat{H}'_{\text{long}} \\ &= i \sum_{i>j} \left(\frac{i}{r} \right)^{i-j} e^{iJ(1-n_{i,-\sigma}-n_{j,-\sigma})} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + \text{H.c.} \\ &\quad + \frac{6-2r^2}{1-r^2} \sin J \sum_j \left(n_{j\uparrow} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left(n_{j\downarrow} - \frac{1}{2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

where $r = i \cot \nu$, $J = -2ih(\nu)$ and r and J are real. We will, however, use the Hamiltonian (4.19) instead of (4.20), since it is easier to extract informations of the model out of the quantum inverse scattering method.

The $Y(\mathfrak{su}(2))$ invariance of $\hat{H}'_{\text{long}}$ shown in (4.18), together with the invariance under the partial particle-hole transformation (2.2), leads us to the result

$$[Q_0^a(\nu), \hat{H}'_{\text{long}}] = 0 = [Q_1^a(\nu), \hat{H}'_{\text{long}}], \quad (4.21)$$

$$[Q_0^{a'}(\nu), \hat{H}'_{\text{long}}] = 0 = [Q_1^{a'}(\nu), \hat{H}'_{\text{long}}], \quad (4.22)$$

where $Q_n^{a'}(\nu)$ is obtained by performing the partial particle-hole transformation (2.2) to $Q_n^a(\nu)$. By construction, the operators $Q_n^{a'}(\nu)$ form another $Y(\mathfrak{su}(2))$ algebra, and we can straightforwardly verify that $[Q_m^a(\nu), Q_n^{b'}(\nu)]$ vanishes for $a, b = x, y, z$; $m, n = 0, 1$. Putting all things together, we can say that the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}'_{\text{long}}$ is $Y(\mathfrak{su}(2)) \oplus Y(\mathfrak{su}(2))$ invariant.

Hereafter we shall assume $\hat{H}'_{\text{long}}$ to be Hermitian, i.e. U is real and both ν and $h(\nu)$ are pure imaginary. With this assumption, $\hat{H}'_{\text{long}}$ can be regarded as a new Hamiltonian for electrons with on-site interaction and variable range hopping. The amplitude of the hopping decays exponentially with the hopping range. There is also an interference effect due to the term $\exp(\pm 2h(\nu)(1 - n_{i,-\sigma} - n_{j,-\sigma}))$. One can easily check that in the $\nu = 0$ limit the hopping terms vanish except for the ones to the neighboring sites, and the usual Hubbard model is restored in this limit. In that sense it is an integrable extension of the Hubbard model (2.1) with variable range hopping.

There is another integrable Hubbard model with variable range hopping discovered earlier [27]. Its Hamiltonian is given by

$$H = \sum_{\sigma, i \neq j} t(i-j) c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + U \sum_j n_{j\uparrow} n_{j\downarrow}, \quad (4.23)$$

with

$$t(s) = -it(-1)^s \left(\frac{L}{\pi} \sin \frac{\pi s}{L} \right)^{-1} \quad (4.24)$$

or

$$t(s) = -i \sinh \kappa (-1)^s / \sinh(\kappa s). \quad (4.25)$$

Though both our model and the above model contains the usual nearest-neighbor-hopping Hubbard model as a limiting case, we do not know whether they can be related with each other.

In closing this section, we shall add a comment. The Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{\text{long}}$ obtained here is different from $\hat{H}_\nu$ obtained from a logarithmic derivative of the monodromy matrix $\mathcal{T}_{mn}(\lambda)_\nu$ on the finite interval. Such things do not occur in the previously studied cases of the fermionic

nonlinear Schrödinger model [22] or the Hubbard model [16, 17]. The relation between the two Hamiltonians $\hat{H}_{\text{long}}$ and $\hat{H}_\nu$ is left as a future problem.

5 Construction of Eigenvectors

5.1 Creation Operators of Quasiparticles

As is the case with the usual Hubbard chain and other integrable models, the entries of the monodromy matrix $\tilde{T}(\lambda)$ can be used to construct multiparticle eigenstates on the vacuum. By calculating commutators between these entries of $\tilde{T}(\lambda)$ and the particle number operator $\hat{N}$, we can see that $B_{a1}(\lambda)_\nu$ and $C_{2a}(\lambda)_\nu$ add $\hat{N}$ by one and $D_{21}(\lambda)_\nu$ adds $\hat{N}$ by two, while $B_{a2}(\lambda)_\nu$ and $C_{1a}(\lambda)_\nu$ reduce $\hat{N}$ by one and $D_{12}(\lambda)_\nu$ does by two. $A_{ab}(\lambda)_\nu$, $D_{11}(\lambda)_\nu$ and $D_{22}(\lambda)_\nu$ keep $\hat{N}$ unchanged. To gain further insight, let us calculate actions of the operators in $\tilde{T}(\lambda)$ onto the vacuum $|0\rangle$. By using (3.6), some simplest ones are calculated as follows;

$$B_{11}(\lambda)_\nu |0\rangle = -\frac{i\rho_6}{\rho_9} \sum_j e^{-ijp(\lambda,\nu)} c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger |0\rangle, \quad (5.1)$$

$$B_{21}(\lambda)_\nu |0\rangle = \frac{\rho_6}{\rho_9} \sum_j e^{-ijp(\lambda,\nu)} c_{j\uparrow}^\dagger |0\rangle, \quad (5.2)$$

$$C_{21}(\lambda)_\nu |0\rangle = -\frac{\rho_2}{\rho_1} \sum_j e^{-ijk(\lambda,\nu)} c_{j\uparrow}^\dagger |0\rangle, \quad (5.3)$$

$$C_{22}(\lambda)_\nu |0\rangle = -\frac{i\rho_2}{\rho_1} \sum_j e^{-ijk(\lambda,\nu)} c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger |0\rangle, \quad (5.4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} D_{21}(\lambda)_\nu |0\rangle &= \sum_{j,l} c_{j\uparrow}^\dagger c_{l\downarrow}^\dagger \left[\theta(j > l) \frac{i\rho_6\rho_2}{\rho_9\rho_1} e^{-ijk(\lambda,\nu)-ilp(\lambda,\nu)} + \theta(j < l) \frac{i\rho_6\rho_2}{\rho_9\rho_1} e^{-ijp(\lambda,\nu)-ilk(\lambda,\nu)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \delta_{jl} \frac{i\rho_3}{\rho_1} e^{-ij\{p(\lambda,\nu)+k(\lambda,\nu)\}} \right] |0\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

where $\rho_j = \rho_j(\lambda, \nu)$ and

$$e^{-ik(\lambda,\nu)} = -\rho_9(\lambda, \nu)/\rho_1(\lambda, \nu), \quad e^{-ip(\lambda,\nu)} = -\rho_8(\lambda, \nu)/\rho_9(\lambda, \nu). \quad (5.6)$$

The commutators between $\text{Det}_q(A(\mu)_\nu)$ and the various operators in $\tilde{T}(\lambda)_\nu$ are calculated from the exchange relation (3.10). The resulting commutators are the same as the case of the original Hubbard model ($\nu = 0$), which is summarized in Appendix B.2 of Ref.[17]. Hence, the commutators between the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{\text{long}}$ and the operators in the matrix $\tilde{T}(\lambda)_\nu$ are

also the same as the $\nu = 0$ case;

$$[\hat{H}_{\text{long}}, B_{a1}(\lambda)_\nu] = -(2 \cos p(\lambda) + U/2) B_{a1}(\lambda)_\nu, \quad (5.7)$$

$$[\hat{H}_{\text{long}}, B_{a2}(\lambda)_\nu] = (2 \cos k(\lambda) + U/2) B_{a2}(\lambda)_\nu, \quad (5.8)$$

$$[\hat{H}_{\text{long}}, C_{1a}(\lambda)_\nu] = (2 \cos p(\lambda) + U/2) C_{1a}(\lambda)_\nu, \quad (5.9)$$

$$[\hat{H}_{\text{long}}, C_{2a}(\lambda)_\nu] = -(2 \cos k(\lambda) + U/2) C_{2a}(\lambda)_\nu, \quad (5.10)$$

$$[\hat{H}_{\text{long}}, D_{12}(\lambda)_\nu] = 2(e^{ip(\lambda)} + e^{-ik(\lambda)}) D_{12}(\lambda)_\nu, \quad (5.11)$$

$$[\hat{H}_{\text{long}}, D_{21}(\lambda)_\nu] = -2(e^{ip(\lambda)} + e^{-ik(\lambda)}) D_{21}(\lambda)_\nu, \quad (5.12)$$

where

$$e^{ik(\lambda)} = -e^{2h(\lambda)} \cot \lambda, \quad e^{ip(\lambda)} = -e^{-2h(\lambda)} \cot \lambda. \quad (5.13)$$

Other entries $D_{11}(\lambda)$, $D_{22}(\lambda)$ and $A_{ab}(\lambda)$ commute with $\hat{H}_{\text{long}}$. The above results justify the interpretation of $B_{a1}(\lambda)$, $C_{2a}(\lambda)$ and $D_{21}(\lambda)$ as creation operators. $B_{a1}(\lambda)$ and $C_{2a}(\lambda)$ create single particle excitations, whereas $D_{21}(\lambda)$ creates a bound state of two particles. For example, from $\hat{H}_{\text{long}}|0\rangle = 0$ and (5.10) we deduce

$$\hat{H}_{\text{long}} C_{2a_1}(\lambda_1)_\nu \dots C_{2a_n}(\lambda_n)_\nu |0\rangle = - \sum_{j=1}^n (2 \cos k(\lambda_j) + U/2) C_{2a_1}(\lambda_1)_\nu \dots C_{2a_n}(\lambda_n)_\nu |0\rangle. \quad (5.14)$$

Similarly, the applications of the operators $B_{a1}(\lambda)$ or mixed products of operators $B_{a1}(\lambda)$ and $C_{2a}(\lambda)$ on the vacuum produce eigenstates of the Hamiltonian.

Let us consider the relation between these creation operators and Yangian $Y(\mathfrak{su}(2))$. Since the Yangian generators $Q_n^a(\nu)$ ($n = 0, 1$; $a = x, y, z$) are coefficients of the power expansion of $A(\mu)_\nu$, the commutators between $Q_n^a(\nu)$ and operators $B(\lambda)_\nu$, $C(\lambda)_\nu$, and $D(\lambda)_\nu$ can be obtained from (3.10). The results are the same as in the case of the Hubbard model [17];

$$[Q_0^a(\nu), B(\lambda)_\nu] = -\frac{1}{2} \tilde{\sigma}^a B(\lambda)_\nu, \quad (5.15)$$

$$[Q_1^a(\nu), B(\lambda)_\nu] = \sin p(\lambda) \tilde{\sigma}^a B(\lambda)_\nu + \frac{U}{2} \varepsilon^{abc} \tilde{\sigma}^b B(\lambda)_\nu Q_0^c(\nu), \quad (5.16)$$

$$[Q_0^a(\nu), C(\lambda)_\nu] = \frac{1}{2} C(\lambda)_\nu \tilde{\sigma}^a, \quad (5.17)$$

$$[Q_1^a(\nu), C(\lambda)_\nu] = -\sin k(\lambda) C(\lambda)_\nu \tilde{\sigma}^a + \frac{U}{2} \varepsilon^{abc} C(\lambda)_\nu \tilde{\sigma}^b Q_0^c(\nu), \quad (5.18)$$

$$[Q_0^a(\nu), D(\lambda)_\nu] = [Q_1^a(\nu), D(\lambda)_\nu] = 0. \quad (5.19)$$

These commutators will be used to investigate Yangian representations of the multiparticle eigenstates.

5.2 Scattering States

Observing the cases of other integrable models studied earlier [18, 28], we propose the following two pairs of normalized creation operators of scattering states,

$$R_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger = i^{3-\alpha} \frac{\rho_1(\lambda, \nu)}{\rho_2(\lambda, \nu)} C_{2\alpha}(\lambda)_\nu D_{22}(\lambda)_\nu^{-1} \quad (\alpha = 1, 2), \quad (5.20)$$

$$\hat{R}_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger = i^{\alpha-1} \frac{\rho_9(\lambda, \nu)}{\rho_6(\lambda, \nu)} B_{3-\alpha,1}(\lambda)_\nu D_{11}(\lambda)_\nu^{-1} \quad (\alpha = 1, 2). \quad (5.21)$$

In these formulae $\alpha = 1$ corresponds to spin-up and $\alpha = 2$ to spin-down. The numerical prefactors have been obtained by demanding that $R_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger$ and $\hat{R}_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger$ generate normalized one-particle states,

$$R_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger |0\rangle = \sum_j e^{-ijk(\lambda, \nu)} c_{j,\alpha}^\dagger |0\rangle, \quad \hat{R}_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger |0\rangle = \sum_j e^{-ijp(\lambda, \nu)} c_{j,\alpha}^\dagger |0\rangle. \quad (5.22)$$

Hereafter we assume that λ is chosen in such a way that $R_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger$ and $\hat{R}_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger$ create physical states. This means for $R_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger$ that $k(\lambda, \nu)$ has to be real and for $\hat{R}_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger$ that $p(\lambda, \nu)$ has to be real.

By the method in Ref. [29], hermitian conjugation can be performed to the operators $R_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu$ and $\hat{R}_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu$, and the resulting normalized annihilation operators are

$$R_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu = i^{2-\alpha} \frac{\rho_8(\lambda', \nu)}{\rho_6(\lambda', \nu)} D_{11}(\lambda)_\nu^{-1} C_{1,3-\alpha}(\lambda)_\nu, \quad (5.23)$$

$$\hat{R}_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu = i^{\alpha-2} \frac{\rho_9(\lambda', \nu)}{\rho_2(\lambda', \nu)} D_{22}(\lambda)_\nu^{-1} B_{\alpha 2}(\lambda)_\nu, \quad (5.24)$$

with $\lambda' = \pi/2 - \lambda^*$. The commutation rules between the operators $R_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger$, $\hat{R}_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger$, $R_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu$, $\hat{R}_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu$ are

$$R_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger R_\beta(\mu)_\nu^\dagger = -r(\lambda, \mu)_{\gamma\delta, \alpha\beta} R_\gamma(\mu)_\nu^\dagger R_\delta(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger, \quad (5.25)$$

$$R_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu R_\beta(\mu)_\nu^\dagger = -r(\mu, \lambda)_{\gamma\alpha, \delta\beta} R_\gamma(\mu)_\nu^\dagger R_\delta(\lambda)_\nu, \quad (5.26)$$

$$\hat{R}_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger \hat{R}_\beta(\mu)_\nu^\dagger = -r(\mu, \lambda)_{\gamma\delta, \alpha\beta} \hat{R}_\gamma(\mu)_\nu^\dagger \hat{R}_\delta(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger, \quad (5.27)$$

$$\hat{R}_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu \hat{R}_\beta(\mu)_\nu^\dagger = -r(\lambda, \mu)_{\gamma\alpha, \delta\beta} \hat{R}_\gamma(\mu)_\nu^\dagger \hat{R}_\delta(\lambda)_\nu, \quad (5.28)$$

$$R_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger \hat{R}_\beta(\mu)_\nu^\dagger = -\hat{R}_\beta(\mu)_\nu^\dagger R_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger, \quad (5.29)$$

$$R_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu \hat{R}_\beta(\mu)_\nu^\dagger = -\hat{R}_\beta(\mu)_\nu^\dagger R_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu. \quad (5.30)$$

Here we neglected δ -function contributions from some singular points, e.g., $\lambda = \mu$.

The operators $R_\alpha(\lambda)$, $R_\alpha(\lambda)^\dagger$ and $\hat{R}_\alpha(\lambda)$, $\hat{R}_\alpha(\lambda)^\dagger$ form a representation of the graded Zamolodchikov-Faddeev algebra with S -matrix $r(\lambda, \mu)$. These representations may be identified as representations of left and right Zamolodchikov-Faddeev algebra, respectively [30, 18, 31, 32, 33]. The operators $R_\alpha(\lambda)^\dagger$ and $\hat{R}_\alpha(\lambda)^\dagger$ are graded as odd, which implies that they are creation operators of fermionic quasi-particles.

We shall present two-particle states generated by $R_\alpha(\lambda)^\dagger$ to know physical meanings of $R_\alpha^\dagger(\lambda)_\nu$;

$$R_1(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger R_1(\mu)_\nu^\dagger |0\rangle = \sum_{j,l} c_{j\uparrow}^\dagger c_{l\uparrow}^\dagger e^{-ijk(\lambda,\nu)} e^{-ilk(\mu,\nu)} |0\rangle, \quad (5.31)$$

$$R_2(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger R_2(\mu)_\nu^\dagger |0\rangle = \sum_{j,l} c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger c_{l\downarrow}^\dagger e^{-ijk(\lambda,\nu)} e^{-ilk(\mu,\nu)} |0\rangle, \quad (5.32)$$

$$\begin{aligned} R_1(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger R_2(\mu)_\nu^\dagger |0\rangle &= \sum_{j,l} c_{j\uparrow}^\dagger c_{l\downarrow}^\dagger \left[\theta(j < l) e^{-ijk(\lambda,\nu)} e^{-ilk(\mu,\nu)} \frac{v(\lambda) - v(\mu)}{v(\lambda) - v(\mu) + iU} \right. \\ &\quad + \theta(j < l) e^{-ijk(\lambda,\nu)} e^{-ilk(\mu,\nu)} + \theta(j < l) e^{-ilk(\lambda,\nu)} e^{-ijk(\mu,\nu)} \frac{-iU}{v(\lambda) - v(\mu) + iU} \\ &\quad \left. + \delta_{jl} e^{-ij\{k(\lambda,\nu)+k(\mu,\nu)\}} F(\lambda, \mu, \nu) \right] |0\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (5.33)$$

$$\begin{aligned} R_2(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger R_1(\mu)_\nu^\dagger |0\rangle &= \sum_{j,l} c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger c_{l\uparrow}^\dagger \left[\theta(j > l) e^{-ijk(\lambda,\nu)} e^{-ilk(\mu,\nu)} \frac{v(\lambda) - v(\mu)}{v(\lambda) - v(\mu) + iU} \right. \\ &\quad + \theta(j < l) e^{-ijk(\lambda,\nu)} e^{-ilk(\mu,\nu)} + \theta(j < l) e^{-ilk(\lambda,\nu)} e^{-ijk(\mu,\nu)} \frac{-iU}{v(\lambda) - v(\mu) + iU} \\ &\quad \left. + \delta_{jl} e^{-ij\{k(\lambda,\nu)+k(\mu,\nu)\}} F(\lambda, \mu, \nu) \right] |0\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (5.34)$$

where

$$F(\lambda, \mu, \nu) = \frac{\rho_9 \rho_6}{\rho_4 \rho_8}(\lambda, \mu) \left(e^{h(\lambda)+h(\mu)-2h(\nu)} \cos \lambda \cos \mu + e^{-h(\lambda)-h(\mu)+2h(\nu)} \sin \lambda \sin \mu \right). \quad (5.35)$$

From these wavefunctions, like in the case of the Hubbard model, we conjecture that the n -particle state

$$R_{\alpha_1}(\lambda_1)_\nu^\dagger \cdots R_{\alpha_n}(\lambda_n)_\nu^\dagger |0\rangle \quad (5.36)$$

is a normalized in-state if $k(\lambda_1, \nu) < \cdots < k(\lambda_n, \nu)$ and a normalized out-state if $k(\lambda_1, \nu) > \cdots > k(\lambda_n, \nu)$. Here “normalized” means that the magnitude of the incident wave is unity. Similarly, for the $\hat{R}$ operators, we conjecture that the n -particle state

$$\hat{R}_{\alpha_1}(\lambda_1)_\nu^\dagger \cdots \hat{R}_{\alpha_n}(\lambda_n)_\nu^\dagger |0\rangle \quad (5.37)$$

is a normalized out-state if $p(\lambda_1, \nu) < \cdots < p(\lambda_n, \nu)$ and a normalized in-state if $p(\lambda_1, \nu) > \cdots > p(\lambda_n, \nu)$. We have not found out its proof yet.

The Yangian representation of the multiparticle states can be investigated by the following commutators from (5.15)-(5.19);

$$[Q_0^a(\nu), R_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger] = \frac{1}{2} R_\beta(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger \sigma_{\beta\alpha}^a, \quad (5.38)$$

$$[Q_1^a(\nu), R_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger] = -\sin k(\lambda) R_\beta(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger \sigma_{\beta\alpha}^a + \frac{U}{2} \varepsilon^{abc} R_\beta(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger \sigma_{\beta\alpha}^b Q_0^c(\nu), \quad (5.39)$$

$$[Q_0^a(\nu), \hat{R}_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger] = \frac{1}{2} \hat{R}_\beta(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger \sigma_{\beta\alpha}^a, \quad (5.40)$$

$$[Q_1^a(\nu), \hat{R}_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger] = -\sin p(\lambda) \hat{R}_\beta(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger \sigma_{\beta\alpha}^a - \frac{U}{2} \varepsilon^{abc} \hat{R}_\beta(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger \sigma_{\beta\alpha}^b Q_0^c(\nu). \quad (5.41)$$

These formulae induce an action of the Yangian on n -particle states [34, 22, 17]. Noting that $Q_0^a(\nu)|0\rangle = 0 = Q_1^a(\nu)|0\rangle$, we obtain the action of the Yangian on the $n = 1$ sector as

$$Q_0^a(\nu) R_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger |0\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\beta\alpha}^a R_\beta(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger |0\rangle, \quad (5.42)$$

$$Q_1^a(\nu) R_\alpha(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger |0\rangle = -\sin k(\lambda) \sigma_{\beta\alpha}^a R_\beta(\lambda)_\nu^\dagger |0\rangle, \quad (5.43)$$

which is identified as the fundamental representation $W_1(-2 \sin k(\lambda))$.

The 2^n -dimensional representation formed by n -particle states (5.36) can be studied by the similar manner as Ref. [22, 17], and is identified as the tensor product representation $W_1(-2 \sin k(\lambda_1)) \otimes \cdots \otimes W_1(-2 \sin k(\lambda_n))$ with co-multiplication Δ defined by

$$\Delta(Q_0^a) = Q_0^a \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes Q_0^a, \quad (5.44)$$

$$\Delta(Q_1^a) = Q_1^a \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes Q_1^a + U \varepsilon^{abc} Q_0^b \otimes Q_0^c. \quad (5.45)$$

This representation is irreducible since $k(\lambda_i)$'s are real. Hence, we conclude that all the n -particle states of (5.36) can be constructed by applying the Yangian generators $Q_n^a(\nu)$ to the highest weight state

$$R_\uparrow(\lambda_1)_\nu^\dagger \cdots R_\uparrow(\lambda_n)_\nu^\dagger |0\rangle, \quad (5.46)$$

which is clearly proportional to

$$c_\uparrow(k(\lambda_1, \nu))^\dagger \cdots c_\uparrow(k(\lambda_n, \nu))^\dagger |0\rangle, \quad (5.47)$$

with $c_\alpha(k)^\dagger = \sum_j e^{-ij^k} c_{j\alpha}^\dagger$. If we use $\hat{R}$ operators instead of R , we reach the similar conclusion with $k(\lambda)$ replaced by $p(\lambda)$ and the definition of the comultiplication changed to

$$\Delta'(Q_0^a) = Q_0^a \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes Q_0^a, \quad (5.48)$$

$$\Delta'(Q_1^a) = Q_1^a \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes Q_1^a - U \varepsilon^{abc} Q_0^b \otimes Q_0^c. \quad (5.49)$$

5.3 Bound States

In order to investigate structures of bound states, let us begin with the two-particle bound states. Among two-particle states

$$C_{2a}(\lambda_1)_\nu C_{2b}(\lambda_2)_\nu |0\rangle, \quad (5.50)$$

we should set $(a, b) = (2, 1), (1, 2)$ in order to obtain bound states, which follows from explicit calculation of wavefunctions. In the former case, in which the eigenstate is calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} C_{22}(\lambda_1)_\nu C_{21}(\lambda_2)_\nu |0\rangle &\propto \sum_{j,l} c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger c_{l\uparrow}^\dagger \left[\theta(j > l)(v(\lambda_1) - v(\lambda_2))e^{-ijk(\lambda_1,\nu)}e^{-ilk(\lambda_2,\nu)} \right. \\ &\quad + \theta(j < l)(v(\lambda_1) - v(\lambda_2) + iU)e^{-ijk(\lambda_1,\nu)}e^{-ilk(\lambda_2,\nu)} + \theta(j < l)(-iU)e^{-ilk(\lambda_1,\nu)}e^{-ijk(\lambda_2,\nu)} \\ &\quad \left. + \delta_{jl}e^{-ij\{k(\lambda_1,\nu)+k(\lambda_2,\nu)\}}(v(\lambda_1) - v(\lambda_2) + iU)F(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \nu) \right] |0\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (5.51)$$

The condition for it to be a bound state is

$$v(\lambda_1) - v(\lambda_2) = -iU, \quad (5.52)$$

$$\Im k(\lambda_1, \nu) = -\Im k(\lambda_2, \nu) < 0. \quad (5.53)$$

Provided that these conditions hold, it follows that

$$C_{22}(\lambda_1)_\nu C_{21}(\lambda_2)_\nu = -C_{21}(\lambda_1)_\nu C_{22}(\lambda_2)_\nu, \quad (5.54)$$

which implies that $(a, b) = (2, 1)$ and $(2, 1)$ cases give the same bound state. To summarize, among the two-particle states (5.50), there is only one bound state, which is achieved in the case $(a, b) = (2, 1)$ with the conditions (5.52),(5.53). We have not, however, succeeded to investigate this condition further due to the complicated form of the function $k(\lambda, \nu)$.

Due to this complicated form of $k(\lambda, \nu)$, we have not found out general forms of multi-particle bound states or their creation operators. But if we simply mimic the construction of bound state operators of the original Hubbard model in Ref. [17], we can formally make “bound state operators” by

$$C_2^{(2m)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{2m})_\nu = C_{22}(\lambda_1)_\nu C_{21}(\lambda_2)_\nu C_{22}(\lambda_3)_\nu C_{21}(\lambda_4)_\nu \cdots C_{22}(\lambda_{2m-1})_\nu C_{21}(\lambda_{2m})_\nu, \quad (5.55)$$

$$D_{22}^{(2m)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{2m})_\nu = D_{22}(\lambda_1)_\nu D_{22}(\lambda_2)_\nu \cdots D_{22}(\lambda_{2m-1})_\nu D_{22}(\lambda_{2m})_\nu. \quad (5.56)$$

$$R^{(2m)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{2m})_\nu^\dagger = C_2^{(2m)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{2m})_\nu D_{22}^{(2m)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{2m})_\nu^{-1}, \quad (5.57)$$

where

$$k(\lambda_{2s}) + p(\lambda_{2s-1}) = \pi \pmod{2\pi}, \quad (5.58)$$

$$\sin k(\lambda_{2s-1}) = \sin k(\lambda_1) + \frac{iU(s-1)}{2}, \quad (s = 1, \dots, m). \quad (5.59)$$

The commutation rules of $R^{(2m)\dagger}$ with $R^{(2n)\dagger}$, $R^\dagger$ or $Q_n^a(\nu)$ are the same as those in the case of the usual Hubbard model ((6.58)-(6.60) in Ref. [17]). But the serious problem with this operator $R^{(2m)\dagger}$ is that we do not know whether it certainly produces physical states. As the case of two-particle bound states ($m = 1$) is already difficult to study, there is little hope that we can get deep understanding of multiparticle bound state operators.

6 Concluding Remarks and Discussion

In this paper we have introduced new integrable variant of the nearest-neighbor Hubbard model with variable range hopping. We have constructed it by the quantum inverse scattering method on the infinite interval at zero density, using the one-parameter deformation of the $\mathcal{L}$ -matrix of the Hubbard model. By construction, together with the knowledge of the case of the Hubbard model studied earlier, this Hamiltonian is among an infinite number of commuting operators and thus integrable. Moreover, it commutes with operators $Q_n^a(\nu)$ ($n = 0, 1$; $a = x, y, z$), which form a representation of the $Y(\mathfrak{su}(2))$ Yangian. If we take the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}'_{\text{long}}$ or $\hat{H}''_{\text{long}}$ instead of $\hat{H}_{\text{long}}$, it is invariant under the partial particle-hole transformation and is $Y(\mathfrak{su}(2)) \oplus Y(\mathfrak{su}(2))$ invariant. Normalized creation and annihilation operators of quasiparticles are explicitly constructed and are shown to form the Zamolodchikov-Faddeev algebra. Multiparticle scattering states are constructed with these operators, while bound states still require further study.

The merits of deriving the Hamiltonian along such line are as follows. First, the existence of the Yangian symmetry can be established without any ad hoc methods. Second, the forms of multiparticle states upon the zero-density vacuum can be derived without any ansatz. They are calculated directly from actions of the elements of the monodromy matrix $\tilde{T}(\lambda)_\nu$ on the vacuum. Derivation of multiparticle wavefunctions by making some kind of ‘‘Bethe ansatz’’ is rather difficult due to the complicated structure of the Hamiltonian.

Although it is not easy to interpret the physical meaning of the term of the phase factor $\exp(\pm 2h(\nu)(1 - n_{i,-\sigma} - n_{j,-\sigma}))$ in the Hamiltonian, it would be interesting to investigate

thermodynamic properties of this new integrable model and it will be studied in separate papers [35].

Acknowledgements

The author benefited from stimulating discussions with F. Göhmann and M. Shiroishi. The author is also grateful to M. Wadati and N. Nagaosa for their continuous encouragements.

Appendix A Expressions of the $\check{\mathcal{R}}$ -matrix and the $\mathcal{L}$ -matrix

In this appendix we present the expressions of the $\check{\mathcal{R}}$ -matrix and the $\mathcal{L}$ -matrix. The $\mathcal{L}$ -matrix [6] is given as

$$\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda) = e^{h(\lambda)\sigma^z \otimes \sigma^z / 2} \left[\begin{pmatrix} -f_{j\uparrow}(\lambda) & ic_{j\uparrow} \\ c_{j\uparrow}^\dagger & g_{j\uparrow}(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} \otimes_s \begin{pmatrix} f_{j\downarrow}(\lambda) & c_{j\downarrow} \\ ic_{j\downarrow}^\dagger & -g_{j\downarrow}(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} \right] e^{h(\lambda)\sigma^z \otimes \sigma^z / 2} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

with the grading $P(1) = 0$, $P(2) = 1$ and functions

$$f_{j\sigma}(\lambda) = (i \cot \lambda)^{n_{j\sigma}} \sin \lambda, \quad g_{j\sigma}(\lambda) = (-i \tan \lambda)^{n_{j\sigma}} \cos \lambda. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

The $\check{\mathcal{R}}$ -matrix is given as [6]

$$\check{\mathcal{R}}(\lambda, \mu) =$$

$$\begin{pmatrix}
\rho_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \rho_2 & 0 & 0 & i\rho_9 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \rho_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & i\rho_9 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_3 & 0 & 0 & -i\rho_6 & 0 & 0 & i\rho_6 & 0 & 0 & -\rho_8 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -i\rho_{10} & 0 & 0 & \rho_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & i\rho_6 & 0 & 0 & \rho_5 & 0 & 0 & -\rho_7 & 0 & 0 & -i\rho_6 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -i\rho_{10} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -i\rho_{10} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -i\rho_6 & 0 & 0 & -\rho_7 & 0 & 0 & \rho_5 & 0 & 0 & i\rho_6 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_2 & 0 & 0 & -i\rho_{10} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -\rho_8 & 0 & 0 & i\rho_6 & 0 & 0 & -i\rho_6 & 0 & 0 & \rho_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & i\rho_9 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_2 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & i\rho_9 & 0 & 0 & \rho_2 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_1
\end{pmatrix}, \tag{A.3}$$

where $\rho_j = \rho_j(\lambda, \mu)$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_1 &= (e^l \cos \lambda \cos \mu + e^{-l} \sin \lambda \sin \mu) \rho_2, \\
\rho_4 &= (e^l \sin \lambda \sin \mu + e^{-l} \cos \lambda \cos \mu) \rho_2, \\
\rho_9 &= (-e^l \cos \lambda \sin \mu + e^{-l} \sin \lambda \cos \mu) \rho_2, \\
\rho_{10} &= (e^l \sin \lambda \cos \mu - e^{-l} \cos \lambda \sin \mu) \rho_2, \\
\rho_3 &= \frac{e^l \cos \lambda \cos \mu - e^{-l} \sin \lambda \sin \mu}{\cos^2 \lambda - \sin^2 \mu} \rho_2, \\
\rho_5 &= \frac{-e^l \sin \lambda \sin \mu + e^{-l} \cos \lambda \cos \mu}{\cos^2 \lambda - \sin^2 \mu} \rho_2, \\
\rho_6 &= \frac{e^{-2h(\mu)} \cos \lambda \sin \lambda - e^{-2h(\lambda)} \cos \mu \sin \mu}{\cos^2 \lambda - \sin^2 \mu} \rho_2, \\
\rho_7 &= \rho_5 - \rho_4, \quad \rho_8 = \rho_3 - \rho_1,
\end{aligned}$$

with $l = h(\lambda) - h(\mu)$. The function $h(\lambda)$ is defined by (2.6). These matrices are identical with those in Ref. [6], except for the point that the spectral parameters λ and μ are shifted by $\pi/4$. These matrices satisfy the exchange relation (2.4). Its one-parameter deformed version

is given by (2.16) with the $\check{\mathcal{R}}$ -matrix presented above and the new $\mathcal{L}$ -matrix given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu^{11} &= \rho_1 n_{j\uparrow} n_{j\downarrow} - i\rho_{10}(n_{j\uparrow} + n_{j\downarrow} - 2n_{j\uparrow} n_{j\downarrow}) - \rho_8(1 - n_{j\uparrow})(1 - n_{j\downarrow}), \\
\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu^{12} &= -i\rho_2 n_{j\uparrow} c_{j\downarrow} - \rho_6(1 - n_{j\uparrow})c_{j\downarrow}, \\
\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu^{13} &= -\rho_2 c_{j\uparrow} n_{j\downarrow} + i\rho_6 c_{j\uparrow}(1 - n_{j\downarrow}), \\
\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu^{14} &= i\rho_3 c_{j\uparrow} c_{j\downarrow}, \\
\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu^{21} &= \rho_2 n_{j\uparrow} c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger - i\rho_6(1 - n_{j\uparrow})c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger, \\
\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu^{22} &= \rho_9 n_{j\uparrow} n_{j\downarrow} + i\rho_4 n_{j\uparrow}(1 - n_{j\downarrow}) - i\rho_7(1 - n_{j\uparrow})n_{j\downarrow} + \rho_9(1 - n_{j\uparrow})(1 - n_{j\downarrow}), \\
\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu^{23} &= \rho_5 c_{j\uparrow} c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger, \\
\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu^{24} &= \rho_6 c_{j\uparrow} n_{j\downarrow} + i\rho_2 c_{j\uparrow}(1 - n_{j\downarrow}), \\
\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu^{31} &= i\rho_2 c_{j\uparrow}^\dagger n_{j\downarrow} + \rho_6 c_{j\uparrow}^\dagger(1 - n_{j\downarrow}), \\
\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu^{32} &= \rho_5 c_{j\uparrow}^\dagger c_{j\downarrow}, \\
\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu^{33} &= \rho_9 n_{j\uparrow} n_{j\downarrow} - i\rho_7 n_{j\uparrow}(1 - n_{j\downarrow}) + i\rho_4(1 - n_{j\uparrow})n_{j\downarrow} + \rho_9(1 - n_{j\uparrow})(1 - n_{j\downarrow}), \\
\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu^{34} &= -i\rho_6 n_{j\uparrow} c_{j\downarrow} + \rho_2(1 - n_{j\uparrow})c_{j\downarrow}, \\
\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu^{41} &= -i\rho_3 c_{j\uparrow}^\dagger c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger, \\
\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu^{42} &= -i\rho_6 c_{j\uparrow}^\dagger n_{j\downarrow} + \rho_2 c_{j\uparrow}^\dagger(1 - n_{j\downarrow}), \\
\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu^{43} &= \rho_6 n_{j\uparrow} c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger + i\rho_2(1 - n_{j\uparrow})c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger, \\
\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_\nu^{44} &= \rho_8 n_{j\uparrow} n_{j\downarrow} + i\rho_{10}(n_{j\uparrow} + n_{j\downarrow} - 2n_{j\uparrow} n_{j\downarrow}) - \rho_1(1 - n_{j\uparrow})(1 - n_{j\downarrow}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\rho_j = \rho_j(\lambda, \nu)$. One can easily check that $\mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)_{\nu=0} \propto \mathcal{L}_j(\lambda)$.

References

- [1] V. E. Korepin and F. H. L. Eßler, eds, *Exactly Solvable Models of Strongly Correlated Electrons* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1994).
- [2] E. H. Lieb and F. Y. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 20 (1968) 1445.
- [3] B. S. Shastry, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56 (1986) 1529; *ibid.* 56 (1986) 2453.
- [4] B. S. Shastry, J. Stat. Phys. 50 (1988) 57.
- [5] M. Wadati, E. Olmedilla and Y. Akutsu, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 56 (1987) 1340; E. Olmedilla and M. Wadati, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60 (1988) 1595.

- [6] E. Olmedilla, M. Wadati and Y. Akutsu, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 56 (1987) 2298.
- [7] O. J. Heilmann and E. H. Lieb, Ann. NY Acad. Sci. 172 (1971) 583; C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 63 (1989) 2144; C. N. Yang and S. C. Zhang, Mod. Phys. Lett. B4 (1990) 759.
- [8] F. H. L. Eßler, V. E. Korepin and K. Schoutens, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67 (1991) 3848; Nucl. Phys. B372 (1992) 559; *ibid.* B384 (1992) 431.
- [9] F. H. L. Eßler and V. E. Korepin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72 (1994) 908; Nucl. Phys. B426 (1994) 505.
- [10] D. B. Uglov and V. E. Korepin, Phys. Lett. A190 (1994) 238.
- [11] P. B. Ramos and M. J. Martins, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. A30 (1997) L195.
- [12] R. Yue and T. Deguchi, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 30 (1997) 849.
- [13] V. E. Korepin, N. M. Bogoliubov and A. G. Izergin, *Quantum Inverse Scattering Method and Correlation Functions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993).
- [14] M. Jimbo and T. Miwa, *Algebraic Analysis of Solvable Lattice Models*, (American Mathematical Society, 1995).
- [15] M. Shiroishi and M. Wadati, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 64 (1995) 57; R. Yue and T. Deguchi, preprint, cond-mat/9701207.
- [16] S. Murakami and F. Göhmann, Phys. Lett. A227 (1997) 216.
- [17] S. Murakami and F. Göhmann, Nucl. Phys. B512 (1998) 637.
- [18] L. D. Faddeev, Sov. Sci. Rev. Math. Phys. C1 (1980) 107; H. B. Thacker, Rev. Mod. Phys. 53 (1981) 253.
- [19] D. B. Creamer, H. B. Thacker and D. Wilkinson, Phys. Rev. D21 (1980) 1523.
- [20] D. Bernard, M. Gaudin, F. D. M. Haldane and V. Pasquier, J. Phys. A26 (1993) 5219.
- [21] F. D. M. Haldane, in Proc. of the 16th Taniguchi Symposium on Condensed Matter Physics (Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1994).
- [22] S. Murakami and M. Wadati, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 29 (1996) 7903.

- [23] S. Murakami and M. Wadati, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 65 (1996) 1227.
- [24] V. G. Drinfeld, in Proc. of the 1986 International Congress of Mathematics (American Mathematical Society, Berkeley, 1986).
- [25] V. Chari and A. N. Pressley, L'Enseignement Mathématique 36 (1990) 267; J. Reine. Angew. Math. 417 (1991) 87.
- [26] V. Chari and A. N. Pressley, *A Guide to Quantum Groups* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994).
- [27] F. Gebhard and A. E. Ruckenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68 (1992) 244; F. Gebhard, A. Girndt and A. E. Ruckenstein, Phys. Rev. B49 (1994) 10926; P. A. Bares and F. Gebhard, J.Phys. Condens. Matter 7 (1995) 2285; Europhys. Lett. 29 (1995) 573; F. Göhmann and V. Inozemtsev, Phys. Lett. A214 (1996) 161.
- [28] F. C. Pu, Y. Z. Wu and B. H. Zhao, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 20 (1987) 1173.
- [29] F. Göhmann and S. Murakami, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 30 (1997) 5269.
- [30] A. B. Zamolodchikov and Al. B. Zamolodchikov, Ann. Phys. 120 (1979) 253.
- [31] F. A. Smirnov, *Form Factors in Completely Integrable Models of Quantum Field Theory* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1992).
- [32] I. M. Khamitov, Theor. Math. Phys. 62 (1985) 217; *ibid.* 63 (1985) 486; J. Sov. Math. 40 (1988) 115.
- [33] C. Gómez, M. Ruiz-Altaba and G. Sierra, *Quantum Groups in Two-Dimensional Physics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996).
- [34] A. LeClair and F. A. Smirnov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A7 (1992) 2997.
- [35] S. Murakami, unpublished.